

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 21, claims 20 and 22 to 38 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 20 to 22, 27 to 29, and 31 to 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 20 to 22, 27 to 29, and 31 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,275 ("Noda et al."). It is respectfully submitted that Noda et al. do not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claim 21 has been canceled herein without prejudice – its subject matter incorporated into claim 20 - thereby rendering moot the present rejection with regard to claim 21.

Claim 20, as amended, describes a ceramic laminate, including, *inter alia*, the feature that the specific Ohmic resistance of the material of the resistor track is at least twice as great as the specific Ohmic resistance of the material of the two lead tracks. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in claim 21 as originally presented.

Noda et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that the specific Ohmic resistance of the material of the resistor track is at least twice as great as the specific Ohmic resistance of the material of the two lead tracks. Noda et al. describe a ceramic heater, including a heat generating resistor (2) comprised of a heat generating portion (21) at a top end and lead portions (23a) and (23b) at a read end.

Noda et al. merely refer to (absolute) ohmic resistance, which is influenced by the geometry of the conductor tracks. In contrast, the present claim refers to **specific** ohmic resistance (i.e. *electrical resistivity*, also referred to as specific electrical resistance or volume resistivity, is a measure of how strongly a material opposes the flow of electric current, the SI unit being the ohm meter ( $\Omega \text{ m}$ )) which is a material property, and therefore according to the present application, a different material is used for the resistor track than for the two lead tracks. Thus, in contrast to Noda et al., the choice of material according to the present claim makes possible a greater width of the resistor track at not too small of a thickness, without its ohmic resistance becoming absolute and undesirably small in comparison to the two lead tracks.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Noda et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Noda et al. do not anticipate claim 20, or claims 22, 27 to 29, and 31 to 38, which depend from claim 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 23 to 26 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 23 to 26 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Noda et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,883,947 ("Murase et al.") It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al. and Murase et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the Office Action does not include any rejections of claims 26 and 30 based on the combination of Noda et al. and Murase et al.

Claims 23 to 25 depend from claim 20 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 20. As more fully set forth above, Noda et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20. Murase et al. is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 20 not disclosed or suggested by Noda et al. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Murase et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features included in claim 20 not disclosed or

suggested by Noda et al. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al. and Murase et al. does not render unpatentable claims 23 to 25, which depend from claim 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Noda et al., Murase et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,750,958 (“Okuda et al.”) It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al., Murase et al., and Okuda et al. does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26 depends from claim 20 and therefore includes all of the features included in claim 20. As more fully set forth above, Noda et al. and Murase et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20. Okuda et al. is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 20 not disclosed or suggested by Noda et al. and Murase et al. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Okuda et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features included in claim 20 not disclosed or suggested by Noda et al. and Murase et al. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al., Murase et al., and Okuda et al. does not render unpatentable claim 26, which depends from claim 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Rejection of Claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Noda et al. and Okuda et al. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al. and Okuda et al. does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 30 depends from claim 20 and therefore includes all of the features included in claim 20. As more fully set forth above, Noda et al. and Okuda et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Noda et al. and Okuda et al. does not render unpatentable claim 30, which depends from claim 20.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**VI. Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 5, 2009

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/  
Clifford A. Ulrich  
Reg. No. 42,194

for

Gerard A. Messina  
Reg. No. 35,952  
KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**